REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is responsive to the outstanding Office Action, and is accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and RCE fee, under 37 CFR 1.114. Entry of the foregoing amendment and consideration of the amendment is therefore respectfully requested.

In the January 24, 2006 Final Office Action, Claim 25 is again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanojia et al (US 2004/0181593) in view of Perlman et al. (U.S. 6,023,585). Claims 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanojia et al (US 2004/0181593) in view of Perlman et al. (U.S. 6,023,585) and further in view of Hubbard (U.S. 2005/0149532)

Claims 25-27, and 29-30 have been amended to further clarify the present invention. New Claims 34-44 have been added. Claims 25 and 37 are independent claims. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the specification, thus no new matter has been added thereby. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the patentability of the pending claims of the present application in view of the amendments and following remarks.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claim 25:

The Office Action cites:

> As to claim 25, Kanojia teaches detecting the attachment of a hardware device to a host system (user plugs in a peripheral device . . . USB port; page 9, section 186-187), getting the device information (the system agent intercepts the plug and play string form the peripheral device; page 9, section 187), establish a connection with a remote server system (the system agent of the network device . . . registering device; page 6, sections 100-103), forwarding to the server host related information includi8ng device information (The assigned GUID . . . system server 100; page 6 section 104 and the system agent 220 . . . system manager 120; page 10, section 188), and delivering to the host system display information based on the information forwarded to the server (page 4, section 72, peripheral events; page 5, section 74 and section 76 and page 7, section 121. A peripheral event is an event relating to peripheral device being connected or disconnected from the network device; page 8, section 148 and section 164).

However, Kanojia does not teach querying the hardware device for device information. Perlman teaches querying the hardware device for device information (The WebTV box 10 requests the device codes from all peripheral devices connected in the daisy chain; column 6, line 11-15).

Kanojia fails to disclose all the elements of amended independent claim 25. Furthermore, Perlman fails to make up for the deficiencies of Kanojia.

With regard to claim 25, Kanojia fails to disclose, a method for directed information delivery to a host system. The method comprising: "detecting attachment of a hardware device to a host system, wherein a client software running on a host system is notified of the hardware device attachment; querying the hardware device for device information, wherein the client software queries the hardware device; establishing a connection with a remote server system; forwarding to the server system host related information including hardware device information, wherein the host related information includes host operating system information and hardware information; and the hardware device information includes device class, device protocol, vendor identification number and other information to identify the hardware device; and said server system searches the world wide web for information related to said host related information and hardware device information and includes promotional or educational materials; and aggregates and formats presentation data based on said search for delivery to the host system; and delivering to the host system formatted presentation data". (Amended claim 1)

Kanojia discloses a system that is different than the one used by the present invention, as defined in Claim 25. Kanojia discloses a system where a server system 100 communicates with embedded client system 200 for generating an initial user profile for a network device. [Kanojia, Paragraph [0099]]. Kanojia uses an elaborate registration process using management console 110 and web browser 210 that displays the registration web page wherein the user submits information which will be used to generate a user profile of user attributes associated with the network device. [Kanojia, Paragraph [0106] and [0107]]. Kanojia registers a network device and is associated with a user profile after the registration process. [Kanojia, Paragraph [0112]].

Kanojia states in Paragraph [0114] that "[b]efore content can be deployed to a targeted device, the content **must** be stored in the database along with a group profile and an activation schedule". The content delivery process/system of Kanojia is based on group profiles.

None of the foregoing are needed or used by the adaptive aspects of the present invention, as outlined in amended Claim 25. The process steps of Claim 25 do not require any group profiles or activation schedules.

As discussed above, the Office Action states in paragraph 5 that Kanojia does not teach the step of querying the hardware device for device information. Applicant respectfully agrees. However, Applicant respectively disagrees that Perlman makes up for this deficiency.

In Perlman, an electronics unit determines all peripheral devices attached to the unit at system initialization and requests that the device code from all the peripheral devices. In the present invention, the hardware device is queried when the attachment of the device is detected and not when the system is initialized. As these steps are different, one cannot be substituted for the other.

Furthermore, evening assuming for arguendo that these steps were interchangeable, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Kanojia with that of Perlman. In order to establish a proper prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching of the desirability of making the specific combination that was made by Applicant. The motivation, suggestion or teaching, may come explicitly from statements in the prior art, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or in some cases, the nature of the problem to be solved. See *In re Dembiczak*, 50

USPQ 2d 1614 (Fed. Cir. 1999). There must be some reason, suggestion or motivation found in the prior art whereby a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention would make the combination. That knowledge cannot come from Applicants' invention itself. See *In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ 2d 1443, 1446 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See *Dembiczak* 50 USPQ 2d. 1617.

The Office Action's motivation for combining the steps is that "it provides a method to obtain necessary data from the device to get the correct driver for that device." [Office Action Paragraph 6]. The invention as articulated in amended Claim 25 is not based on downloading a driver. In fact, the current application is a divisional application which was filed to distinguish the current set of pending claims from the original device driver download claims.

The motivation, suggestion or teaching to combine references, may come explicitly from statements in the prior art, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or in some cases, the nature of the problem to be solved. The Office Action's reasoning does not come from any of these.

Amended Claim 25 has some limitations of the original Claim 26 and hence this amendment is addressing the Examiner's rejection of Claim 26. In rejecting Claims 26-30, the Examiner relied on Kanojia et al. (U.S. 2004/0181593 A1) in view of Perlman et al. (US 6,023,585) further in view of Hubbard (US 2005/0149532 A1).

The Examiner states that Kanojia does not teach the server system searching the World Wide Web for information that is relevant to the host related information. Applicant agrees with that conclusion.

The Examiner states that "Hubbard teaches the server system searching the WWW for information that are related to the host related information. The search engine ...data". (col. 4, lines 31-33). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hubbard provides a “distributed processing system”. (Hubbard, Abstract). Figure 1A shows such a system with client system 108-112; customer systems 152 and server systems 104 and other systems 106. “The server systems 104 send project and benchmark workloads to client systems 134.” [Hubbard, Page 4, Paragraph [0051]]. The client systems 134 send results back to the server systems 104 after the client systems complete processing any given workload. Depending upon the workload project, the server systems 104 may then provide results 156 to customer system 152.” [Hubbard, Page 5, Paragraph [0052]].

Hubbard system/process does not disclose the elements of Claim 25. The reasons why Hubbard cannot be combined with Kanojia are similar to those given above with respect to Perlman.

Assuming arguendo that Kanojia, Perlman and Hubbard can be combined; the combination fails to disclose the elements of Claim 25.

Based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claim 25 is patentably distinguishable over Kanojia, Perlman and Hubbard, either alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of amended independent claim 25.

Claims 26-27 and 29-30:

Claims 26-27 and 29-30 depend from claim 25, and are thus patentably distinguished over the cited art for at least the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 26-27 and 29-30.

New Claims 34-36:

Claims 34-36 depend from claim 25, and are thus patentably distinguished over the cited art for at least the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 34-36.

New Claims 37-44:

New Claims 37-44 are patentably distinguishable over Kanojia, Perlman and Hubbard, either alone or in combination for at least the same reasons given above with respect to Claim 25. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 37-44.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes Claims 25-30 are allowable, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicant's representative might expedite prosecution of the application, he is cordially invited to call at the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/24/06 By: Heidi Eisenhut

Heidi L. Eisenhut
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 46812

Klein O'Neill and Singh, LLP
43 Corporate Park, Suite 204
Irvine, CA 92606
Telephone: (949) 955-1920
Facsimile: (949) 955-1921

Docket No.: M9192-DIV